

STCG TANK SUBGROUP MEETING MINUTES

December 9, 1997

WELCOME/UPDATES/MEMBER SURVEY RESULTS (CATHY LOUIE)

Cathy opened the meeting. She noted that feedback from the member survey suggested getting more TWRS project people involved in the Subgroup to provide more "meat" for discussion. This meeting was focused on TWRS feed staging (i.e., feed preparation) technology needs. Cathy's plan is for the Subgroup to take "small bites" of the TWRS Program and discuss technology needs and TFA responses to the needs at each meeting.

Report on November Management Council Meeting

Cathy reported that Cavanaugh Mims, DOE-OR Chair of the Oak Ridge STCG Tank Subgroup, attended the November Management Council meeting and presented a video showing Hanford technologies that were successfully deployed at Oak Ridge. His message to Hanford was that the projects must "own" the technologies.

This prompted Paul Scott to state that we need to revisit our efforts to get the TWRS decision-makers involved in this Subgroup. He described how Cavanaugh asked the Management Council "Who in this room owns a tank?" Only Lloyd Piper raised his hand.

November 10 Letter from Al Alm

Copies of Al Alm's November 10, 1997 letter were distributed to all participants for review offline.

TDI Project Status (Paul Scott)

Paul said that the Slurry Monitoring Deployment Plan was sent to DOE/Idaho at the end of November. A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed with Oak Ridge, and funds are already at RL. Cavanaugh plans to use Hanford on a deployment activity using some small (55,000-gallon) tanks that could be retrieved. Another possibility is retrieval of the small crib settling tanks outside of Z-Plant. The TWRS Program should spend the money on retrieval rather than characterization of those tanks.

Very little is happening with the other tank-related TDI proposals. The corrosion proposal is moving forward without TDI funds. In addition, the pit decontamination proposal is now part of HTI.

Lloyd's Comments on the Subgroup Work Plans: Programs Should Set Goal of \$25M Savings via New Technologies in the Site Baseline

Copies of Lloyd Piper's comments on the Subgroup FY98 Work Plans were distributed to all participants for review offline. These comments were previously distributed electronically.

TWRS FEED STAGING TECHNOLOGY NEEDS (RUDY CARREON)

Rudy reviewed the general TWRS flowsheet for low-activity waste feed staging and high-level waste feed staging for the immobilization facilities. He described the "readiness to proceed" activities that DOE and the contractors have underway. Deliverables from the private contractors are due to DOE in January 1998, when deliverable evaluation will begin. At the conclusion of deliverable evaluation (May 1998) and the readiness to proceed evaluations, DOE will award part b of the TWRS Privatization acquisition strategy.

The TWRS Privatization contract allows DOE to turn over the feed staging tanks to the private vendor either empty, with feed that's within the feed envelope, or full of what's already in them. Discussions are currently ongoing between DOE and the vendors. There is no additional tank space available for feed staging operations. Some Subgroup members thought that we should revisit the decision on how the feed staging tanks will be turned over and what technology needs exist under each scenario.

Rudy noted that there are no problem constituents for Phase I Privatization. For Phase II, chromium is a problem for HLW vitrification.

PLANNING BASIS FOR PRETREATMENT/IMMOBILIZATION (JIM HONEYMAN)

Jim discussed the following technical uncertainties in pretreatment/sludge washing:

- solution stability
- chemical removal
- solids settling/separation
- sampling and analysis.

He also mentioned that the Phase II contracting strategy is not yet defined.

Dirk Dunning asked what happens if a private vendor does the retrieval and immobilization, but DOE has the pretreatment part? Cathy responded that DOE is putting a heavy emphasis on management of the interfaces, so no matter how DOE acquires services from contractors, the pieces will logically fit together.

Cathy noted that the following FY97 technology needs are related to feed staging: #2, 5, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 22.

TFA RESPONSE TO NEEDS (TOM BROUNS)

Tom started by telling us that the TFA's integrated priority list was developed for the four tank sites using four prioritization criteria. Dirk Dunning asked Tom to provide the Subgroup with a map of how the technology needs relate to funded TTPs and R&D results. Tom stated that this is already available in the TFA MYWP on the TFA web page. The address is:

<http://www.pnl.gov/tfa/program/fy98mypp/index.stm>

Tom reviewed the funded TFA activities that are responding to our needs.

TFA is not fully integrated with the EMSP work yet. EMSP wants to see which needs are being addressed, which are likely to be solved, and which are real "show-stoppers".

The Subgroup wants to know if there are places on the TWRS flowsheet where:

- the Program is in trouble
- there are big opportunities for technology insertion

SUGGESTIONS ON FIELD TRIPS

- General Tank Farm Tour by Don Wodrich
- Specific FDH Technology Demonstrations/Deployments?
- Technologies Being Developed in the Lab?
- Cross-Site Transfer System (leak detection, new couplings, pump stations)

It was suggested that the Subgroup focus on technologies needed to meet the 2006 Plan goals, as long as they are consistent with the TPA. The 2006 Plan may go away, but we will still have to show a return on investment (ROI) for new technologies. Congress will insist on that.

WRAP-UP/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

We need to develop an annual calendar of Tank Subgroup activities and identify bite-size chunks of the TWRS Program to discuss each month.

Paul Scott has a new role with the TWRS Project Direction Group in FDH, working for Tony Umek. Jim Honeyman has a similar role in LMHC doing TWRS strategic planning. Our Subgroup needs a technology acquisition strategy. We must be forward-thinking. The Subgroup can help provide the thinking to help TWRS managers make decisions. We can use the TWRS mid-level logic to identify risks and then try to resolve them. We must find technology insertion points.

Paul suggested that TDI efforts be focused on a small number of proposals this year.

The following potential future agenda items have been identified. Please review them and send your input on what you would like to see on the meeting agendas next year to Linda Fassbender.

- Identification of TWRS technology-related problems to be addressed
- Subgroup annual calendar of activities
- TWRS Risk Management List and Ties to Technology Solutions
- TFA update on their schedule for responding to our FY98 technology needs
- Potential technology tours

ACTION ITEMS

1. Pulse the members regarding their attendance each month to be sure we have adequate participation to make a meeting worthwhile (Linda Fassbender). Note that members are free to send a delegate in their place.
2. Provide a status update on all the TDI tank-related proposals at each Subgroup meeting (Paul Scott).
3. Call Todd Martin and explain what we're doing in the Subgroup meetings now and see if he will start coming again (Linda Fassbender).
4. Provide status of technology needs tracking table for next meeting (Cathy Louie).
5. Send suggestions for technology tours to Linda Fassbender (everyone).
6. Develop a strawman calendar of activities for discussion at the January Subgroup meeting (Linda Fassbender).
7. Send input on potential future agenda items to Linda Fassbender (everyone).

MEETING ATTENDEES

Gary Ballew (Pacific Rim Enterprise Center)
Bill Bonner (PNNL)
Tom Brouns (PNNL)
Rudy Carreon (DOE-RL)
Dirk Dunning (Oregon Office of Energy)
Linda Fassbender (PNNL)
Pete Gibbons (NHC/TFA)
Marcus Glasper (DOE-RL)
Jim Honeyman (LMHC/TWRS)
Cathy Louie (DOE-RL/TWRS)
Billie Mauss (DOE-RL)
Vince Panesko (Pacific Rim Enterprise Center)
Wade Riggsbee (Yakama Indian Nation)
Paul Scott (FDH)

NEXT MEETING

The next Tank Subgroup meeting will be held on January 13, 1998 from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m., in the ISB-1 White Bluffs Room.